

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

1. In the specification

The specification is amended to add appropriate section headings and to remove explicit reference to the claims.

Entry of the amendment to the specification is kindly requested.

2. In the claims

Claim 1 is amended to recite that the “implementation has a plurality of applications associated therewith, with a separate entry being present for each application and in that the implementation is executed in different ways depending on which entry the implementation starts with.” Support for this amendatory language is found in the specification at paragraphs [0013] (ll. 7-9) and [0014] (ll. 6-8).

Claim 10 is amended similarly to claim 1 but in terms of the method steps.

No new matter is introduced via the amendment to the claims.

Entry of the amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

3. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/69183 (*Vilppula*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is kindly requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the following observations.

Before proceeding on the merits of *Vilppula*, a description of the claimed subject matter of claim 1 is provided.

Specifically, amended claim 1 requires a chip card having at least one application for which an implementation is provided. Unlike known chip cards, the inventive chip card does not have one entry which is associated with the implementation and means of with which the implementation can be accessed for execution of the application. Instead, the inventive chip card has a plurality of entries which are associated with the same implementation, such that a plurality of applications is associated with a single implementation, wherein a separate entry is provided for each application.

Accordingly, each of the plurality of entries, which refer to the same implementation, represents an individual virtual application associated with that entry, even though only one implementation is provided. It follows that depending on through which entry the corresponding application is accessed, the implementation can be executed in different ways, which in turn correspond to different virtual applications.

In contrast to the prior art, the inventive chip card allows for an economization of a large amount of resources on the chip card since only a single common implementation is required for the different applications corresponding to the plurality of entries. Thus, since not every application requires an exclusively associated implementation, but merely an exclusively associated entry to the implementation, the consumption of resources of the application is negligible compared to chip cards having separate implementations.

Turning to the teachings of *Vilppula*, it is submitted that *Vilppula* fails to disclose or suggest an association of several entries present on a chip card with the same implementation

In general, *Vilppula* discloses a method to control the access to applications on a storage medium in such a manner that access to an application for which a specific user is authorized is provided to the user in a simple manner (p. 11, ll. 8-9). If the user logs into the storage medium, for example by means of a password, the user's profile is evaluated and the user is able to execute applications defined in the profile (p. 3, ll. 1-5). According to this process, an authorization for each individual application is not required, but all applications defined in the user profile are made accessible at once.

Taking these observations on *Vilppula* into consideration, it is clear that *Vilppula* teaches exactly one entry as being associated with each implementation of an application, which is the same as in the prior art devices discussed in the pending application at paragraph [0002].

Vilppula describes application identifiers (AID) which correspond to the entries of pending claim 1 because the AIDs refer to an implementation. However, *Vilppula* expressly points out that the user profiles do not correspond to the claimed

entries of claim 1 since the profiles of *Vilppula* merely define the applications to which an authorized user has access, whereas the AIDs refer to respective implementations (p. 11, ll. 8-9).

Unlike in amended claim 1, *Vilppula* discloses that only one AID associated with a corresponding implementation exists, namely the AID associated with the profile of the currently logged in user (p. 13, ll. 1-21; p. 14, ll. 25-27). Thus, while *Vilppula* describes several profiles which may exist that have an AID referring to a certain implementation in common, only one profile is active at any time, since only one user can be logged in at the same time. Moreover, *Vilppula* describes that the unique association of each implementation with one AID may be concluded from page 12, lines 9-24 wherein it is stated that “the DIR will contain only the AIDs for WAP, e-money, UMTS1 and PSA...”.

Lastly, it is clear from *Vilppula* that it fails to teach the features of amended claim 1 wherein several applications are associated with each implementation with a separate entry present for each application and that the implementation is executed in different ways depending on which entry is started with.

From these observations, it is respectfully submitted that *Vilppula* fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature required by amended claim 1. Claims 2, 3 and 6-7 are at least patentable based on their dependency from claim 1 and their individually recited features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of the prior art is kindly requested.

4. Rejection of claims 4 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/69183 (*Vilppula*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the discussion above with regard to amended claim 1 in view of *Vilppula*, and the following observations.

Claims 4, 8 and 9 are dependent from amended claim 1 discussed above. These claims are at least patentable in view of their dependency from claim 1 and their individually recited features.

As noted above, the method of independent claim 10 includes the new limitations that were added to claim 1. These new limitations are pertinent to this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of *Vilppula* on the basis that *Vilppula* teaches exactly one entry or AID is associated with each implementation of an application. For the reasons provided above, the teachings of *Vilppula* are contrary to the particular requirements of claim 10.

In addition to the failure of *Vilppula* to teach every feature required by the pending claims, it is submitted that the skilled person would not consider *Vilppula* to teach a solution for a chip card which has extended functionality and uses as few resources as possible. The reason being is that *Vilppula* relates to a method for a simple management of access rights and is hence directed to a different technical field from the claimed chip card.

From these observations, it is readily apparent that *Vilppula* does not render claims 4 and 8-11 unpatentable.

Accordingly withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: October 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205